

**TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**May 27, 2009**

*Chair Knox-White* called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:33 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL** – Roll was called and the following recorded.

Members Present:

John Knox White  
Michael Krueger  
Jane Lee  
Robert McFarland  
Kathy Moehring  
Eric Schatmeier

Members Absent:

Srikant Subramaniam

Staff Present:

Obaid Khan, Supervising Civil Engineer  
Barry Bergman, Transportation Coordinator

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. April 22, 2009

*Commissioner Krueger* moved approval of the minutes for the April 22, 2009 meeting. *Commissioner Schatmeier* seconded the motion. Motion passed 6-0. (Absent: *Commissioner Subramaniam*).

3. **AGENDA CHANGES**

None.

4. **COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS**

*Chair Knox White* noted that the Bike Task Force and the Alameda Point Advisory Task Force had not met.

*Commissioner Krueger* indicated the Transit subcommittee members have prepared comments on the scope of work to update the transit plan. A meeting will be set up to discuss this.

*Staff Bergman* stated timeframe and level of staff involvement will need to be discussed given the current resources.

*Chair Knox White* asked for a report back on how this is going to fit into upcoming grant cycles.

*Staff Khan* noted that the City has applied for grant funding for the transportation system management and transportation demand management plan. Program funding is dependent on the state's budget.

*Commissioner Krueger* mentioned the Transit subcommittee provided feedback on the possible service cuts as well.

*Staff Khan* noted that AC Transit will be bringing their proposed cuts to their Board on June 24. Discussions will be brought to both the ILC and the TC meetings.

*Commissioner Lee* shared that she will be retiring from AUSD at the end of the school year and is submitting her resignation from the TC. She thanked all for their support this year and applauded the Commission's work.

## **5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS**

There were none.

## **6. OLD BUSINESS**

### **6A. Review of the Final Draft Estuary Crossing Feasibility**

*Staff Khan* presented the revised draft, which was brought originally to the TC in March. The draft had been modified to reflect the comments provided by the Commission at that time, primarily related to the recommendations and cost estimates. There are three sets of recommendations:

- 1) Minor modifications to Posey Tube – This would include moving the railing on the easterly side of tube only to create additional space for bicyclists and pedestrians, and improving the surface. The cost has been reduced from \$7 million to \$2.5 million.
- 2) Water shuttle/taxi – An intermediate solution, this would improve access for those traveling between Alameda and Oakland.
- 3) Bridge, tunnel or elevated structure – This was the preferred solution. Several concerns were mentioned regarding this type of crossing: the need for clearance from the Coast Guard; need for the bridge to remain closed during peak times for commuters; height elevation and vertical clearance for bridge (if a fixed bridge) and opening/closing lengths of time if a drawbridge. Dialogue needs to be continued with Coast Guard, and to date no replies have been received.

Noted that if the funding was received, staff would like to move forward with the water taxi/shuttle study. The bike/ped bridge would remain as an open item. The City is also working towards providing a SMART Corridor project on Webster/Constitution Way.

The City had applied for a \$600,000 grant from ACTIA (which has been denied) and \$300,000 from CalTrans bicycle transportation account (BTA) to conduct a project study report equivalent. Awaiting news from CalTrans on the status of the BTA grant proposal.

*Chair Knox White* inquired as to why the City would chose the more expensive \$60 million low moveable bridge over the \$40 million high fixed bridge.

*Staff Khan* replied that the vertical elevation of the high fixed bridge would be 175'; elevator and ramps would be necessary and that was not an attractive concept to the public.

*Chair Knox White* asked about the \$1.5 million in bus improvements; he asked how these are bike related. Why was a water shuttle the preferred use over the buses?

*Staff Khan* replied that congestion in the tube was not attractive to the public as well as the fare required for the trip. The water shuttle/taxi was a preferred method.

*Chair Knox White* discussed docking and compared what would be involved in providing 15 minute headways for water taxis and road-based shuttles.

*Staff Khan* replied that the size of the boats was not evaluated on that level. The analysis was qualitative at this time.

*Commissioner Krueger* asked for clarification on the wording in the report, referring to congestion.

*Staff Khan* replied that congestion referred to how the opening and closing of the bridge in addition to the possible railroad gate being closed, would affect the automobile congestion when these two items were in effect.

### **Open public hearing.**

*Jim Strehlow* thanked Public Works for their handling of the suggested crossings and alternatives. He opposes SunCal's \$1 billion monorail option, but supported special shuttles for buses only. Having only one ferry is not enough, and this would be expensive. The public needs to realize that we need to come up with a solution.

*Lucy Gigli, Bike Alameda* stated that she was happy with the second draft and the preferred recommendation of the water shuttle.

### **Close public hearing.**

*Commissioner Krueger* discussed the summary of his comments regarding land uses and congestion. Stated that congestion did not seem to be relevant to the land use. He requested that language be included to ensure that the preferred option would coordinate with the construction of a high speed rail alignment, should that happen in this area. High speed rail could impact grade separations.

*Chair Knox White* asked why a project study report was needed to study the water taxi project since it's possibly going to cost the same as just implementing the water taxi. He asked what the cost of the study would be for the water taxi option.

*Staff Khan* answered that the study would help obtain funding and flush out any environmental issues. The cost for the water shuttle would be significantly less than the actual construction, and would be an estimated \$300-400,000.

*Chair Knox White* stated that he would like to consider this study's need. He noted that the recommendation seemed to be geared towards a water shuttle only, but that operational characteristics are not optimal. He suggested looking into other options further.

*Staff Khan* replied that in the next level of analysis, all operational characteristics would be evaluated.

*Chair Knox White* expressed concern over spending thousands of dollars on a project study report when the goals haven't been established and not sure if they will be achieved. He suggested that the staff recommendation should be reworded. Not sure that the money should be spent on the study only to find out later the bridge cannot be built. He stated that he would support the water shuttle because the community is in favor, but wants to assure that we are providing a service that meets the project goals.

*Staff Khan* stated that many options were presented to the public. The public did not support some options and those were eliminated.

*Commissioner Moehring* made a motion to accept the report with the comments provided by the Commission. *Commissioner Krueger* seconded the motion.

- Coordinate project with alignment for high speed rail; potential grade separations.
- Long term bridge only be pursued once issues identified in report are understood.
- Land use and how project would address congestion should be clarified.
- Presentations were made at other boards and commissions, except TC
- Clarify why the PSR is necessary as a next step.
- During the PSR, once the operational characteristics are known, look at some of the other options and to determine if better service could be provided for less money.
- p. 23 – minimize language re: clearance of pedestrians and bicyclists and comparing to congestion (55:00)
- Note that existing bridges don't open during peak because of delays on I-880; however, even though the bike/ped bridge won't impact 880, 12-20 minute delays to open and close the bridge would have a major impact on bicyclists and pedestrians.
- There is concern about user demand and the catchment area for the project. Analysis needs to look at how the facility will fit into a larger system. If people are having to transfer to another mode to get where they are going, this reduces the likelihood of serving a significant number of people per day
- Bridge is technically feasible, not financially feasible.

Motion passed unanimously, 6-0 (Absent: *Commissioner Subramaniam*).

## **7B. Alameda County Congestion Management Agency Draft Community Based Transportation Plan**

*Staff Bergman* stated that the CMA undertook this project, based on a 2001 study by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), which identified a number of communities for further study regarding transportation gaps in low-income communities. He provided staff comments regarding the recommendations presented in the study: 1) Traffic calming issues would have to be addressed in consultation with other departments, especially fire and police; 2) It would be helpful if the report could be as specific as possible in identifying the locations where improvements were requested by residents; 3) He requested clarification regarding a recommendation to improve pavement and bicycle striping for bicyclists near the Ferry Terminal. He also noted that sidewalk maintenance is typically the responsibility of adjacent property owners.

*Bruce Brubaker*, of Design Community Environment in Berkeley, the consultant on the project, introduced *Diane Stark* of ACCMA.

*Diane Stark* stated that ACCMA's studies are focused on low-income populations and where there are gaps in transportation.

*Bruce Brubaker* discussed the project and presented a slide show. He noted that the intent of the plan was to recommend strategies to address needs, to set priorities and hear the communities' priorities, estimate the costs and to find potential funding sources to implement the recommendations. He noted that the consultant team worked with a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and City staff to identify changes since the last Census. Outreach was done by phone interviews and questionnaires; they received 125 back regarding transportation.

*Mr. Brubaker* noted that the consultant team conducted many outreach meetings with seniors, youth groups, low-income residents and people with disabilities in different locations in Alameda. Discussed the strategies about problems that were identified by the community. Broken down into groups: transit strategies (AC Transit, BART, Para transit, Ferry); pedestrian strategies; bicycle strategies; driving strategies. Criteria considered community, transportation, and implementation and financial factors.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* inquired how the array of strategies was chosen.

*Bruce Brubaker* responded that the community identified problems. The solutions came from the consultant and the TAC. The priorities were initially set by the TAC and the consultant and looking for feedback on those criteria.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* asked if the strategies that had been discussed related to development at Alameda Point.

*Staff Bergman* replied that only the needs and gaps as they were presented now, in the present, were analyzed.

*Bruce Brubaker* noted there were needs at Alameda Point currently; recommended bus stop and shelter improvements, most at Alameda Point. The plan is intended to be a fund raising tool. Will list priorities for projects.

*Chair Knox White* asked *Diane Stark* if CMA is committed to following through on this.

*Diane Stark* replied that the plan is used as a way to identify projects and to list the needs of the community. When funding becomes available Alameda can compete for the funds. Lifeline Transportation Funds are available every 3-4 years. AC Transit applied for funds in Alameda for bus service. Other funds are available, such as Measure B.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* asked if the Lifeline funding was allocated to CMAs by population of low-income people.

*Diane Stark* agreed and stated that Alameda County did have a higher population of low-income people than most of the nine counties in the Bay Area. There is a share for the whole county. Only 5 areas have been identified, Alameda being one of them. Alameda could compete well because it has a plan already.

### **Open Public Hearing**

*Jay Smith*, member of Operation Dignity stated many people at the Alameda Collaborative have absolute needs for transportation. He has been involved with meetings regarding the 63 Bus. He noted the shelters have no benches; some locations have no shelters, etc. Feel these issues need to be addressed.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* inquired if the rankings on the report were staff's or the public.

*Bruce Brubaker* replied that it was a staff analysis but some were from the public. He listed the issues: 1) bus stop and shelter improvements, 2) Shopper shuttle service on weekends at Alameda Point, 3) increase route 63 services on weekend and frequency, 4) implement route 51 on time performance improvements, 5) improve bus service to Alameda Hospital and schools.

*Chair Knox White* asked for clarification regarding the proposed shopper shuttle on the weekends, if it was different from AC Transit's service.

*Bruce Brubaker* responded that there were two different options of addressing the same issue. Route 63 Service improvement is costly; the shuttle would be a lower cost improvement.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* asked if the community requested higher frequency on the weekend than on the weekdays.

*Bruce Brubaker* stated that the community is confused with a bus route that does one thing on the weekend and another on weekdays, particularly new residents, such as at Operation Dignity. For people who need to get to BART, it takes an hour to get to Fruitvale BART on a weekend, but it is only 15 minutes to get to 12<sup>th</sup> St. on a weekday.

*Jay Smith* noted again, the significant impact of the 63 Bus' lack of service on the weekends; particularly affected are those needing the Food Bank on Constitution Way and those needing to go grocery shopping at Lucky's.

*Bruce Brubaker* continued listing items – increase and improve information regarding transit services, increased education regarding Paratransit, increase transit information for seniors, install real time information at the bus stops, create a low-income fare discount, to maximize accessibility of existing discounts, improving accessibility to the Oakland/Alameda Ferry, increase bus to BART frequency, implement route 50 frequency improvements. Pedestrian strategies included expanding safe routes to schools program, improve pedestrian experience at Alameda Point, install in pavement crosswalk lighting, and install night lighting.

*Chair Knox White* noted that Staff wants to be selective as to where the in pavement lighting is placed, as it is quite expensive.

*Staff Khan* noted that if there are too many of the in-pavement lighting facilities, people will start to ignore them. Also where they are installed affects their impact.

*Bruce Brubaker* responded that the wording and the priority for the in pavement lighting will be revised. He continued with the list of items being discussed: Pedestrian strategies: Alameda has a good grid for bicycle/pedestrian users, but there was a need for improved pedestrian/bicycle safety in the tube, install pedestrian refuge islands. For bicyclists, more bicycle lanes were desired, as well as an increase in the bicycle capacity onboard buses, increased bicycle options for youth and low-income residents, improve bicycling access between Alameda/Oakland, improve pavement and bicycle striping near the Ferry Terminal.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* noted that creating more bicycle lanes seems to be more significant for the overall transportation in Alameda. Bike lanes serving particular origins and destinations that are of interest and concern to the community we're talking about.

*Chair Knox White:* suggested that the bicycle strategy be consistent with the bicycle feasibility study. Noted use the term water shuttle/taxi instead of bicycle barge.

*Jim Strehlow* discussed the use of safest routes to Oakland and Emeryville.

*Lucy Gigli* addressed *Commissioner Schatmeier's* comments. Stated that bicycling is the best mode for youth and low-income people to get around and that any improvements to the citywide bicycle networks would help all populations.

*Chair Knox White:* suggested last four items on page 6-58 be removed as not relevant to meeting the needs of the community we're trying to meet.

*Bruce Brubaker:* discussed the last strategy to institute an auto loan program for low-income residents, and that car sharing was not useable by lower-income populations. He noted all comments will be revised and further comments should be directed to Diane Stark. Another presentation will be given to the ACCMA board for review and approval on June 25; public is welcome.

*Chair Knox White* noted that line 63 route displayed on the map is incorrect. He also noted it was odd that two of the top three strategies are the same, but different operators. Suggested they could be the same goal. Weekend service to Alameda Point is the goal.

*Staff Bergman* noted that the route and number of the 63 Bus might change in the future, therefore note the report in such a manner that it would describe the route without referring to the bus number.

*Commissioner Moehring* refers to page 6-52, C, amend to reflect the fact that the pipe in the tube will not be fixed and that the capital cost would be \$2.5 million.

*Commissioner Krueger* referred to page 6-19, discussion regarding bus service to the hospital and the bus stop at Otis and Willow. Report stated the stop had been rejected. Thought the stop was on hold, but not rejected.

*Chair Knox White* suggested wording be changed regarding the bus stop.

*Staff Khan* noted that the line 63 issues will be going to Council in July.

*Commissioner Krueger* noted that the staff report should cite this report in terms of the issues to access to the hospital.

**7A. Approval Parking Restrictions at Casual Carpool Site at Santa Clara and Webster and Enhancement of a Casual Carpool Site on Park Avenue near Encinal Avenue**

*Staff Bergman* presented the staff report. Stated the casual carpool had been discussed several times in the past when there were parking, bus interferences and ticketing issues with its location. Carpoolers relocated their pickup spot, and staff conducted surveys. It was determined the riders liked being near a bus stop; in case they did not get a carpool driver to pick them up, so they could hop on the bus. A new location was discussed on the East side of Broadway at Encinal Avenue; it was next to a traffic signal and had a wide travel lane, which should benefit pedestrians and minimize impacts on traffic circulation. Additional outreach was conducted and it initially seemed people were supportive of that location. Upon sending notifications out to people in the vicinity, there was much opposition from residents and carpoolers. Staff responded by modifying the recommendation to try and improve the location where it is currently being done. A comment was received from the liquor storeowner on the corner of Encinal & Park Avenue regarding interference in the driveway. He asked that people keep his driveway clear, but did not express opposition to the carpool site. An outreach campaign will be done asking riders to stay clear of the driveway and not make U-turns on Encinal Avenue. In terms of Santa Clara and Webster stop, the parking restriction to keep the free spaces clear between the hours of 7-9 a.m., M-F, has been received favorably. The recommendation is to support the parking restrictions on Santa Clara and Webster Street and to conduct the outreach campaign for the casual carpool site at Encinal and Park Avenue.



*Commissioner Krueger* pointed out a discrepancy on the map and asked if the project to alter the shape of the street at Park Avenue and Encinal Avenue would impact the casual carpool.

*Staff Khan* noted that due to budget cuts, this \$60,000 project was one that was cut. The idea is to take the pork chop out and narrow the turn and hopefully this will happen when funding becomes available.

### **Open public speaking**

*John Avignon and Elizabeth Noak* residents of Alameda of Marti Rae Court, near the casual carpool site. They are affected by the carpoolers who are trashing their front yard and blocking their driveways. Concerned that this was a permanent decision and that they now have inherited this problem. Inquired if City will be participating in cleanup. They noted that there was no city trashcan at the site.

*Staff Khan* suggested these concerns be included in the community outreach effort. Trash can issue will be discussed with Public Works.

*Chair John Knox White* asked Staff what the time frame was for the proposed removal of the pork chop island at Encinal Avenue at Park Avenue.

*Staff Khan* noted that due to the budget cuts; the earliest this project would be considered would be at least 3 years away.

*Chair John Knox White* stated that if the speakers are unhappy with the recommendation that will be going forward, they have the opportunity to appeal their decision to the City Council. Noted casual carpooling is a difficult issue and problems, such as these, always come up.

*Commissioner Krueger* asked if there was any enforcement that could be done to those who are lacking respect for others' property, such as littering. Agrees to add this issue to the outreach and to provide a trash can for public use.

*Commissioner Moehring* discussed the number of drivers performing illegal U-turns in the City, especially in commercial business districts. Hopes that Staff can help mitigate any issues surrounding the speakers' concerns.

*Staff Khan* mentioned that Staff will be bringing this up with the Alameda Police Department; enforcing U-turns.

*Chair John Knox White* recommended coming back and looking at these issues in 6 months and possibly at that time a better solution will be available. Also, the proposed AC Transit service cuts could impact transit service in this area.

## Close Public Hearing

*Commissioner Krueger* moved the staff recommendation with the following changes:

- Request the addition of a trash can; note to outreach program to respect the neighborhood
- request the Alameda Police Department to enforce the moving violations in the area;
- if the pork chop island removal project is implemented, it should be coordinated closely with casual carpool activities, since the opportunity to use the extra space is there
- The proposal should be revised if there are bus line changes servicing the area.
- Monitor the neighborhood concerns and adjust accordingly.

*Commissioner Moehring* seconded the motion.

*Commissioner Schatmeier* stated opposition regarding casual carpooling. Feels that it is one of the great transportation environmental evils in the East Bay. Doesn't feel any money should be spent on this issue. Will not vote in favor.

Motion passed 5-1 (Oppose: *Commissioner Schatmeier*. Absent: *Commissioner Subramaniam*).

## 8. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

### Broadway/Jackson Update

*Staff Khan* noted that there was nothing new to report. Stated that the Boatworks project was moving forward with a Draft EIR expected in 2-3 mos.

### Proposed AC Transit Schedule Changes

*Staff Bergman* noted that on June 24<sup>th</sup> the proposed schedule changes would be going to the AC Transit Board. Proposals due to be brought before the TC on July 22 then to the ILC on July 29. A public hearing will be held sometime in August. Final package for adoption due back to the AC Transit Board on September 9. The expected limitation date will be in December or January.

*Staff Bergman* announced that Chair Knox White and Commissioner Schatemeier's terms would be ending in the end of June, Commissioner Lee was resigning, therefore vacancies to be filled and appointments made prior to July's meeting.

Stated that the agreement to finalize with City Car Share to have two vehicles based in Alameda was in the final process.

## 9. ADJOURNMENT: 10:15 p.m.